

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. The amendments to those Claims find support in the Specification on page 11, line 24 through page 12, line 10 and do not add new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 USC § 103(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,643,825 issued to Li in view of USPN 6,585,778 issued to Hind. Of the rejected Claims, Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 8-12 depend from Claim 7. Claim 1 is a method Claim. Claim 7 is a system claim for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Because, as discussed below, Claim 1 distinguishes over Li and Hind, so do the remaining claims. As such, the rejections of claims 2-12 under §103 will not be addressed directly.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for deploying a web-based application and requires the following limitations:

- (a) generating a data structure representing a flow and associated forms for the application;
- (b) associating with the application a plurality of style documents, ones of said documents being tailored to characteristics of different clients;
- (c) providing to a server a processor for processing said application;
- (d) in response to a request for a form from a client to the server, the processor accessing a set of data sources for the requested form defined in the application and aggregating the data into a single generated data document and selecting a style document that corresponds to the characteristics of the client, the processor executing a style processor to process the generated data structure and the selected style document to generate the requested form; and
- (e) forwarding the form processed at the server to the client.

The Examiner asserts that the Li, col. 4, lines 60-67 teaches limitation (a) above. The cited section reads as follows:

FIG. 1B is a flowchart that illustrates operations of generating reformatted screens according to the present invention. According to FIG. 1B, a host screen is provided to a user, such as a developer or an administrator (block 100). The host screen can comprise an XML stream that represents the data included in the host screen. The user selects a desired style to be applied to the host screen, using, for example, a GUI (block 105). A first data structure, such as an XML data structure, is generated and stored that includes a description of the components of selected style to be recognized at run-time for reformatting the host screen (block 110). The above steps are repeated for all of the hosts screens that the user wishes to reformat (block 115).

Nothing in the cited section teaches generating a data structure representing a flow and associated forms for the application as required by the first limitation. The cited section describes presenting a user with a host screen. The user selects a style through a GUI. A data structure is then generated that describes the "components of selected style" that are to be recognized. Those steps are repeated for each host screen.

Consequently, the data structure referred to by Li does not represent a flow and associated forms. Li's data structure merely includes "a description of the components of selected style."

The Examiner asserts that the Li, col. 7, lines 35-47 teaches limitation (b) above. The cited section reads as follows:

Specifically, the StyleDescription includes Smartmaster tags that refer to the Smartmaster.RTM. selected by the user and the associated document type and look. The Layout tag specifies multiple occurrences of paragraph and table components (Component Type="paragraph" and Component Type="table") and an Interaction tag that specifies a command line input (Action_to_select type='command' cap="value").

The tags included between the Layout and /Layout tags are generated based on the layout specified by the Smartmaster.RTM. selected by the user and the layout's relationship to the components in the host application screen described in Table 1.

While the cited section describes an XML data structure called a "StyleDescription," it does not teach "associating with the application a plurality of style documents, ones of said documents being tailored to characteristics of different clients" as required by the second limitation of Claim 1. More particularly, the cited section makes no mention of associating different style sheets with an application where different style sheets are tailored to a different clients.

The Examiner admits that Li does not teach limitation (d) above. Instead, the Examiner relies on Hind, col. 4, lines 15-31. The cited section reads as follows:

This technique comprises: providing an input document representing a response to a user request; providing a Document Type Definition (DTD) corresponding to the input document, wherein the DTD has been augmented with one or more references to one or more stored policy enforcement objects, wherein each of the stored policy enforcement objects enforces a data policy for an element of the input document; and executing an instrumented style sheet processor, wherein this execution further comprises: loading the augmented DTD; resolving each of the one or more references in the loaded DTD; instantiating the policy enforcement objects associated with the resolved references; and executing selected ones of the instantiated policy enforcement objects during application of one or more style sheets to the input document, wherein a result of this execution is an output document reflecting the execution.

- Neither Li or the cited section of Hind make mention of “accessing a set of data sources for the requested form defined in the application and aggregating the data into a single generated data document,” as required by limitation (d). Although Hind does discuss the use of a style processor, Hind does not teach selecting a style document that corresponds to a particular client and then “executing a style processor to process the generated data structure and the selected style document to generate the requested form” as required by limitation (d).

For these reasons, Claim 1 is felt to distinguish over Li and Hind. Consequently Claims 2-12 are also felt to distinguish over Li and Hind.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-12 are allowable over the art cited by the Examiner. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Jack H. McKinney
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,685
(208) 433-1991